WAR AND THE LAMBETH CONFERENCE

TWO SHILLINGS

WAR AND THE LAMBETH CONFERENCE

Some Unresolved Issues

A Commentary on the Report of the Committee of the Lambeth Conference of 1958 on 'The Reconciling of Conflicts between and within Nations'

by members of the Anglican Pacifist Fellowship

'The Conference calls Christians to subject to intense prayer and study their attitudes to the issues involved in modern warfare'

Resolution 107 of the Lambeth Conference, 1958

'War as a method of settling international disputes is incompatible with the teaching and example of our Lord Jesus Christ.'

Resolution of the Lambeth Conference of 1930, repeated in 1948 and 1958

1968—YEAR OF DECISION ?

Introduction

Among the topics discussed by the Lambeth Bishops at their meeting in 1958, 'The Reconciling of Conflicts between and within Nations' may be thought to have attracted less than its fair share of attention.

It is true that the Committee which dealt with this topic had no recommendations of a startling or revolutionary nature to offer. It is also true that they confessed to a division on the morality of nuclear weapons (2.126). They did, however, call on Christian people to 'subject their attitudes (sc. on modern warfare) to intense prayer and study' (ibid. cf. Resolution 107).

The authors of this pamphlet have taken this exhortation seriously. As committed pacifists, we shall doubtless be suspected of approaching a complex issue with *a priori* convictions. But we think it should be clear to all who read the Committee's Report attentively that it raises certain theological issues of fundamental importance. **We believe that these issues are vital to the proper understanding of the Gospel, and that the Church today is ineffective in its witness precisely because it is not facing them.**

Our aim in publishing this pamphlet is not to argue the case for pacifism, nor to suggest that non-pacifist Christians are guilty of bad faith or slovenly thinking: rather we seek to bring these issues into the open and urge our leaders to commit themselves one way or the other, much as Elijah did at Mt. Carmel: 'How long halt ye between two opinions? If the Lord be God, follow him; but if Baal, then follow him' (I Kings 18. 21).

Pacifism has usually been regarded as an option for the individual conscience. Some have even gone so far as to call it a Counsel of Perfection, a special vocation for those who can receive it, like celibacy or the religious life. We reject the double standard implied by this view, and call upon all Christians to take an unequivocal stance on this matter. **We urge them to recognise that if the pacifist witness is valid at all, it is witness to an imperative which stems from the very heart of the Gospel.**

Note: References such as (2.118) refer to the page numbers of *The Lambeth Conference* 1958: *The Encyclical Letter from the Bishops together with the Resolutions and Reports (S.P.C.K. and Seabury Press,* 1958).

I. Reconciliation through Christ and his Church

' At the heart of the Christian revelation lies the truth of faith that God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself . . . it is the Church's privilege, as it is its greatest glory, to declare that word of reconciliation which God has committed to it.

' This word is not an utterance of a detached observer, but is mediated through the knowledge and experience of men fully involved in human affairs. It is in and through the conflicts of life that God speaks to his people ' (2.118).

As a statement of principle, this could hardly be improved upon; but here, as in many other instances, we find ourselves constrained to spell out in detail the theological implications. In particular, we suggest that there is need for a deeper analysis of the words ' conflict ' and ' reconciliation '.

(a) Conflict is not in itself an evil; rather it is an inescapable fact of human experience.[1] Conflict is bound to arise whenever individuals or groups interact: it is the means chosen to resolve conflicts about which moral judgements are in place.

The Bible shows us two methods which may be described as the Way of Cain and the Way of Christ. Cain resolves his conflict with Abel by self-assertion and violence (cf. I John 3.11,12)[2]; Christ resolves man's conflict with God by self-denial and non-resistance. Men and nations have always chosen the way of Cain when their interests are at stake: as for the way of Christ, it cannot be claimed that ' it has been tried and found wanting; rather it has been thought difficult, and not tried ' (Chesterton).

(b) A reconciler or peacemaker is not so much a third party who mediates in a conflict between two others, as it were holding

---

[1] ' the reconciliation of conflicts between nations to which Christians are committed involves. . . . The acknowledgement that God has set us in a world in which certain tensions and conflicts are essential elements in growth ' (2.127).

[2] ' The message you have heard from the beginning is this: that we should love one another; not as Cain, who was a child of the evil one and murdered his brother. And why did he murder him? Because his own actions were wrong, and his brother's were right.'

the ring. He is himself involved in the conflict, making peace by absorbing the aggressiveness of men and so transforming it. In the previous paragraph we contrasted our Lord with Cain; here the contrast is between Christ and Moses. The latter, having slaughtered an Egyptian for attacking a Hebrew, tries to mediate in a conflict between two of his own countrymen and is understandably rejected. If the *lex talionis* is to apply (as it did in the Egyptian's case) the aggressor can only expect punishment (Exodus 2.11–14 cf. Acts 7.23–28). Jesus explicitly rejects mediation of this kind: when asked to arbitrate in a family dispute, he replies (perhaps with a deliberate echo of the Exodus story), 'Who set me over you to judge or arbitrate?' (Luke 12.13,14). Jesus is not an impartial observer—a kind of celestial U Thant—trying to patch up a quarrel between an angry God and a disaffected human race. He is God incarnate 'reconciling the world to himself' (2 Corinthians 5.19), 'bearing the sins of many' (Isaiah 53.12), and so 'abolishing sin by the sacrifice of himself' (Hebrews 9.26). He is a peace *Maker*.

It is important to stress this point because the Church's role as peacemaker has been considered (if at all) in a Mosaic rather than a Christian light. The Pope at the United Nations was a classic example of this: appealing from his position of neutrality to warring nations and ideologies, begging them to lay down their arms. The Church's vocation is in fact much more costly, and much more effective than this. If she is to be Christ's ambassador, appealing to the world in God's name, to be reconciled to God (2 Cor. 5.20), she must be prepared to die with Christ. She must abandon all pretence of this wordly status, all attempts to achieve security on this world's terms. She must be bombed in North Vietnam and sniped at in South Vietnam: persecuted in China, ignored in Western Europe; oppressed with the non-whites in South Africa, beaten up in Detroit, massacred with the missionaries in the Congo, 'always bearing about in the body the dying of the Lord Jesus that the life also of Jesus might be made manifest in our mortal flesh' (2 Cor. 4.10).

II. The Meaning of ' Salvation '

'. . . the Church's primary contribution to the peace of the world through the ministry of reconciliation is to continue faithfully the task of preaching Christ crucified in his ministry of reconciliation, and of drawing men into the reconciled and reconciling, forgiven and forgiving, redeemed and redeeming, community of faith. We dare not forget that his ministry, which created this community, led him to an ignominious death. The Church is Christ's Church only when its members live together in the spirit of Calvary, as those ready to pay the price as well as to inherit the blessing of the peacemaker ' (2.121).

This, again, is splendid stuff. But there is a dangerous tendency (which could be illustrated from several passages in the Report)[1] to assume that the vocation of the Church is adequately expressed by the witness of the individual. When the Church is considered in her corporate aspect, the standards of this world are too readily accepted.

If the Church (not merely individuals within the Church) is to be faithful to her divine vocation in the ways we have indicated, she cannot fail to bear fruit, in the long run, to the Father's glory[2]. It is sheer faithlessness to imagine that the demands of the Gospel represent an ideal (' perfectionist ethic ' is the phrase commonly used, e.g. 2.121) from which a greater or lesser declension is, in practice, inevitable. In the short run, the Church's faithfulness to her witness (' martyrdom ' in the strict sense) may well appear to the world as failure, just as the Cross appeared as failure. But the Christian must get his priorities right: obedience to Christ comes first—the results of such obedience can be left in his hands. There is always a risk involved in taking the Way of the Cross: we go forth in the darkness of faith, bearing his reproach, not knowing whither we go, but trusting in his promise that to those

---

[1] e.g. ' Every layman is called to be the Church ' (2.124); ' reconciliation . . . involves: 1. The duty and opportunity of every individual Christian to be a channel of reconciliation in all personal relationships ' (2.127).

[2] John 15.2. The context of this saying—the Discourse on the True Vine—gives added support to our thesis.

who seek *first* the Kingdom of God and his righteousness, all these things (peace, security, social justice) shall be added (Matthew 6.33).

Christians need to ask themselves once again what they understand by the proclamation of Jesus as 'Saviour of the World'. It is regrettably true that for many the phrase implies the rescue of souls from the world (despite John 17.15)[1]. The Church's task is then understood as the conversion of individuals: the redemption of society may follow as a consequence of this, but this is no integral part of the Gospel. But Jesus proclaimed a Kingdom—a society in which God's reign, which exists *de jure* throughout the universe, is accepted and acted upon *de facto*. The Gospels present the Kingdom, not as a future ideal, but as a present reality manifested in the New Israel where Christ is present in Word and Sacrament. ('Lo I am with you alway. . . .' Matt. 28.20, 'Where two or three are gathered together in my Name there am I in the midst of them' Matt. 18.20, 'He was known of them in the breaking of bread' Luke 24.35.) In this community the reconciling power of Christ is experienced (I John 3.14)[2] in a mutual self-giving that overflows into evangelism and works of mercy. This was the power that 'turned the world upside down' (Acts 17.6).

Jesus clearly intended that his disciples should continue his ministry of reconciliation on behalf of the world. He said that they were to be a city set on a hill, a candle that must not be hidden under a meal-tub, salt that must not lose its savour (but, by implication, do its job of preserving the food from corruption) (Matt. 5.13–16). Some of the Parables of the Kingdom likewise imply that the church is to transform the world rather than be conformed to it (Rom. 12.2). The Kingdom is like yeast, hidden in an enormous quantity of flour yet leavening the whole amount (Matt. 13.33); it is like a mustard seed which begins as

---

[1] 'I pray thee, *not to take them out of the world,* but to keep them from the evil one.'

[2] 'We know that we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren.'

an invisible speck in the ground and ends as a great tree big enough for birds to come and roost in its branches (ibid. 31).[1]

It would be idle to suggest that all the parables have this political significance, or that the doctrine of the Kingdom exhausts the content of our Lord's teaching. But this important aspect of it has been consistently neglected, and it is time for Christians to wake up to the challenge of their vocation. The salt has already lost much of its savour; let us hope that it has not yet reached the point of being 'good for nothing, but to be thrown away and trodden underfoot' (Matt. 5.13).

III. The Church and Society

'The Church does not exist exclusively to serve its own members. It must always move out into the world to seek and to save. To this end it must identify itself with all men whom it can reach and willingly share their conditions of life' (2.123).

The Church has grown so accustomed to a passive acquiescence in the social *status quo* that she has forgotten the essentially revolutionary quality of her message. Instead of being in the vanguard of reforming movements, she has tended to regard them with suspicion if not outright hostility. If Karl Marx had studied the *Magnificat* he might have seen reason to qualify his

---

[1] This parable is of particular interest because of its Old Testament background. The image of the great tree is taken from Daniel 4.20–22 where it represents the political dominion of Nebuchadnezzar, which he had abused and which is consequently to be taken from him. The influence of Daniel on the Synoptic Gospels has long been recognised by scholars. It appears to have been written just before the time of the Maccabean revolt, as a Tract for the Times to encourage the faithful remnant of Israel. Its message may be summarised as follows: Political power belongs to God, who entrusts it to earthly rulers. These have abused their power, failing to recognise its ultimate source, and in particular have embarked on a campaign of persecution against the Jews (the 'final solution' of Antiochus Epiphanes!). The figure of the Son of Man represents the faithful remnant of devout Israelites or 'Saints of the most high' who must suffer for a limited period, but their vindication will come from heaven, and God will give to them the political dominion which has been abused by the princes of this world.

verdict on religion for it remains a hymn of revolution, however little the Christian congregations who sing it every Sunday seem to be aware of the fact![1]

For nearly three centuries the Church was willing to challenge the world by her witness to humility and love rather than pride and force as the ultimate realities of human life. At the end of this period the world, unable to destroy the Church by frontal assault, embarked on a takeover bid which was nearly successful. The policy of Constantine and his successors has been to make Christianity safe and respectable instead of risky and revolutionary.

But the ' Constantinian era ' is at last drawing to its close. The experiment of running the church and the world in double harness, which began with the Edict of Milan, can at last be seen to have failed. With the best of possible intentions, the church of the fourth century set out to christianise the whole of human society. In the providence of God, she did not quite gain the whole world and lose her own soul, but she came dangerously near to it. Under the pressure of secular interests, the essential Gospel became progressively diluted; the salt gradually lost its savour.

Today the marriage of convenience between Church and State is on the point of break-up, for the simple reason that the secular state no longer needs the church. Where she is not contemptuously rejected, she is accepted only as a decorative and edifying adornment of secular power. A bishop is called in to lend an air of ecclesiastical dignity at the launching of a nuclear submarine, but few suppose that it would have made an atom of difference if

---

[1] It is important to be clear about the meaning of the word ' revolutionary ' when applied to Christianity, since it is liable to be interpreted either in a purely individual (pietistic) sense, or a purely political (Marxist) one. The vital cleavage between Christianity and Marxism is one of application rather than principle. Marxism in practice has accepted the sanctions of fear and force, and the power structures that these generate. Christianity rejects these sanctions outright. It is in fact more radical than Marxism, not less. Pacifism is only one element in a revolutionary witness that calls in question all the assumptions on which modern western society is based. Merely to reject war, and accept the structures of power, money and property with which the Prince of This World bolsters up his kingdom, would of course be hopelessly unrealistic.

the bishop had refused to do so. So far from being the leaven in the lump of human society, the Church has become the icing on the cake!

The official utterances of the church still claim a share in the shaping of human society: how could they do otherwise, without capitulating to the idea that religion offers only ' pie in the sky when you die '? But the clear-cut challenge of the Gospel has been watered down. Instead of ' be ye perfect ' the disciples are urged to ' do what they can '. Instead of ' make disciples of all nations ' we hear of the Church ' helping to create a climate of opinion wherein constructive action becomes possible ' (2.121). In other words, the Church is committed to a policy of Gradualism. She cannot change the situation absolutely, she can only bring a little Christian influence to bear. The demands of the Gospel cannot be met at the present: we must wait until conditions are more favourable. The Sermon on the Mount is dismissed as a ' perfectionist ethic ' impossible to apply in the rough and tumble of human affairs. Indeed, it is one of the sins for which the Church beats its collective breast, that ' it has confused social and political issues by proclaiming its perfectionist ethic as directly applicable to specific situations, and so has avoided the costly process of dealing with questions of relative good and evil ' (2.121). It would be interesting to learn of cases when the Church has actually committed this sin!

IV. The Church and Nationalism

' The nation, like the family, is part of God's ordering of human life. Within this order man grows in character through obedience to God in the duties of common life. The interdependence of nations is evidence of this divine order in the realm of international relationships. Nations, like individuals, are members one of another. If nations are to live together in harmony, their people need to learn from one another and to seek out and value the good in those from whom they differ' (2.124).

The essential newness of the Christian revelation shines forth nowhere so clearly as in its transformation of nationalism. When Saul the Pharisee became Paul the Apostle of the Gentiles, he realized that Christ had broken down the barriers that created conflict among men. In him there is no such thing as Jew and

Greek, slave and freeman, male and female (Gal. 3.28). The Old Testament concept of the Chosen Race as one destined to subdue the nations by military conquest was transfigured, in the light of the Cross, into the Christian doctrine of the Body of Christ, a spiritual community chosen not to be ministered unto but to minister, to lay down its life for the sake of the world.

Nationalism, as our century has known it, is a manifestation of the Old Adam, a work of the devil which Christ came to destroy (I John 3.8). It cannot be blandly asserted that ' the nation . . . is part of God's ordering of human life ' (2.124). It is, of course, true that national cultures have contributed much that is good to human welfare. But nationalism has been the scourge of mankind precisely because it embodies in extreme form the tendency of human groups to set themselves in opposition to other groups, to live by the rule of self-interest, based on force, instead of the rule of the Kingdom, based on love.

There was a time, before the emergence of modern nation states, when the Church could and did claim a loyalty that transcended political frontiers. But the post-Constantinian Church has never succeeded (has she ever tried?) in opening men's eyes to their basic loyalty, which is loyalty to the whole human race: on the contrary, she has sponsored the Crusades in the Middle Ages, practised spiritual imperialism in the nineteenth century, and encouraged her children to pray for victory (' God save the King ' and ' Gott strafe England ') in the twentieth.

If the Church is really the forerunner of the Kingdom, she must recognise her vocation to prefigure the unity of all mankind. The Church of Rome could make this dream come true; so to a lesser extent could the Anglican Communion. Yet how many Arab Christians are prepared to concede Israel's right to exist? how many Europeans in Rhodesia accept their black fellow-Christians as brothers? how many devout Orthodox in Russia regard themselves as closer to their co-religionists in the U.S.A. than to their Communist neighbours? If Jesus is really the Saviour of the world (and not just of the Church) then Christianity has something constructive to say about international conflicts. We cannot apply the Gospel to the private lives of Christians, and regret that when it comes to public affairs our actions must be dictated by considerations of expediency.

V. The 'Lesser Evil'

'It must be acknowledged that in most conditions of conflict the opposing sides accept no Christian obligation or authority. Here the Christian must not allow his ultimate concern to blind him to his duty to be a peacemaker, even though the way be frustrating and exacting. Here compromise, temporary solutions, relative justice, and partial achievement have their place' (2.121).

'Some of the Committee are convinced that in the present uncertain situation, and until international agreement is reached, individual nations are justified in retaining these (sc. thermonuclear) weapons as a lesser evil than surrendering them and increasing the possibility of an unscrupulous attack' (2.126).

The discovery of nuclear weapons raises no unique problems for the Christian conscience; it merely serves to highlight a dilemma which has always confronted Christians when they condone the use of violence in certain circumstances. But we find it more than ever necessary to challenge those who support the retention of nuclear weapons to make their position clear. It is generally accepted that if the deterrent is ever used, it will have failed in its object. Do the supporters of the deterrent in fact subscribe to its use as a means of retaliation? If not, do they regard its retention simply as a piece of bluff?

We venture to answer these questions on their behalf. We think it safe to say that supporters of the nuclear deterrent would be prepared, as a last resort, to sanction its use; and that they would do so by appealing to the principle (so-called) of the 'Lesser Evil'.

According to this doctrine, a Christian may be caught in a dilemma where any course of action is materially wrong. (Shall I tell a lie, or incriminate my friend? shall I administer a lethal dose of morphine, or allow an aged parent to linger on in horrible agony?) In such situations, Christians are taught to choose the lesser evil which, while remaining intrinsically evil, becomes a relative good.

It is noticeable that Roman Catholic text books on Moral Theology are reticent about this doctrine, preferring on the whole to appeal to the Principle of Double Effect (the end alone is willed,

the evil consequences of the act being foreseen but not desired), or other twists of casuistry such as ' mental reservation ' (allowing a speaker to mislead without technically telling a lie). A superb example of this is contained in the section on War in *Moral and Pastoral Theology* by H. Davis, SJ (vol. ii, p. 150). The situation imagined is one in which an enemy hospital ship is known to be ' so valuable to the enemy for future aggression during a war that it may be of vital concern to sink it '. Fr. Davis applies the principle of Double Effect as follows: ' though such a necessity would be deplorable, we think the sinking of it may be justified, for what is attacked is the ship, the deaths of those on board are incidental and not wished, and the loss of a few lives is nothing in comparison with the defeat of a nation. When a nation's existence is at stake, the principles of humanity—as they are called—must be regretfully sacrificed to the very existence of a people, but never the principles of justice.'

The doctrine of the Lesser Evil is in fact invoked here, though not explicitly, in the words ' the loss of a few lives is nothing (i.e. a lesser evil) in comparison with the defeat of a nation '. A pacifist moral theologian is tempted to turn the weapon of Double Effect against its users in this example. The captain of the attacking ship might refuse to fire on the hospital ship, arguing correctly that the destruction of innocent life is contrary to the principles of justice (which are, in fact, identical with the principles of humanity—why the snide parenthesis ' as they are called '?). The defeat of his own country would be a forseen but not directly willed consequence of his action, or rather inaction.

It should be added that Fr. Davis' exposition of the doctrine of the Just War in this section is clear, convincing and sufficient to condemn every single war that has been fought in this century. Later editions contain a reference to nuclear weapons, but Fr. Davis (rightly, in our view) declines to regard these as posing any new problems.

The kind of situation in which it is supposed that the lesser evil has to be chosen invariably arises from human sin; sin creates the evil situation, and part of the damage is precisely that there appears to be no way out except by further sin. Once again the Old Testament affords several moving illustrations. Abner kills

Joab's younger brother Asahel, apparently in self-defence (2 Sam. 2.23). Joab kills Abner (3.27) and is in his turn executed by order of King Solomon (1 Kings 2.28–34). Well may Abner ask, 'Shall the sword devour for ever?' (2 Sam. 2.26). Well might President Johnson ask himself the same question as he surveys the carnage in Vietnam. Looking at any crime from a worldly point of view there seems to be no answer but the *Lex Talionis;* for if crime goes unpunished, this is tantamount to condoning it, and encouraging further crime. And this is clearly a greater evil than the infliction on the criminal of suffering proportionate to his crime.

The Christian Gospel declares that there *is* a way out of this dilemma. (Not the least merit of St. Anselm's treatise *Cur Deus Homo?* is the way in which he highlights this aspect of the Atonement.) God is not faced with a choice between the evil of condoning human sin and the evil of consigning the whole race to perdition. He has found a way that involves neither condonation nor punishment—the Way of the Cross. He *can* forgive (as no earthly judge can forgive) without appearing cynically indifferent to sin and the havoc it wreaks, because he is prepared to accept the burden of sin in his own person.[1] As disciples of Jesus, we are called to take up our Cross and follow him, to deny self, to be ready to lose our lives in order to find them. The martyrs saw no problem; they did not debate whether throwing a few grains of incense on the fire in front of Caesar's statue might not be a lesser evil than depriving their families of the bread-winner. They gave their lives gladly, and were content to leave the consequences in God's hands. Why should it be necessary for modern Christians to capitulate to the morality of the Old Covenant?

We dare to assert that the Church need never subscribe to the doctrine of the Lesser Evil. She may be called upon to make sacrifices which are an evil from the worldly point of view, but

---

[1] David was not allowed to do this. He would have been willing to die for his rebellious son, but Joab saw to it that Absalom's sin was suitably punished (2 Sam. 18.33). Here, as in other respects, the Son of David shows himself more perfect than his ancestor, just as the New Covenant is more perfect than the Old.

the meaning of the Cross is precisely that evil is turned into good by the transforming power of love. Did Jesus consider summoning the twelve legions of angels, and then conclude that his own death would be a lesser evil? No! he chose to die, because by doing so he was fulfilling the Father's will. His death, a disaster from the point of view of this world, is for the Christian the absolute triumph of good over evil.

VI. 'Men and Brethren, what shall we do?'

'The Church has not infrequently failed to contribute to the resolution of conflicts in the political and social fields' (2.121).

The Gospel of Jesus Christ offers mankind a new way of deliverance from the chains of violence and fear. Its adherents have usually preferred to compromise with the world and so to blunt the cutting edge of the Gospel proclamation; but the message remains, and the Church still has the responsibility of interpreting it afresh to each generation. But her claim to do so is nowadays not so much rejected as ignored. Men and women are keenly alive to the need for a new source of reconciliation and love, but they do not look to the Church because they cannot see that membership of the Church makes the smallest practical difference to anybody.

The time has come for the challenge of the Cross to be presented in all its uncompromising realism. The offer of 'spiritual' experience ('accept Jesus as your Saviour and you will discover a peace and joy that you have never known before'), is not enough. Jesus promised his disciples very little in the way of consolation; but he had plenty to say about persecution.[1] When the Church, emboldened by the Holy Spirit, really begins to believe in her mission to transform the world, when she learns to face rejection, contumely, the loss of all worldly things for the sake of her divine Master, then and only then will she bear effective witness to the

---

[1] e.g. Matt. 10.17, 24.9; Mark 13.9–13; Luke 21.12–27; John 15.18–21, 16.33.

Resurrection of Jesus today, as the apostles did in the first century (Acts 4.33).[1]

A French Communist has passed the following judgement on contemporary Christianity:

'The Gospel is a much more powerful weapon for the renovation of society than is the Marxist view of the world. Yet it is we who will conquer the world. We Communists do not play with words. Of our salaries and wages we keep only what is necessary, and the rest we give out for propaganda purposes. To this same propaganda we also devote our leisure time and part of our vacation. You, however, give only a little time and scarcely any money for the spreading of Christ's Gospel.'

It is time for the Church to wake out of sleep (Romans 13.11). Let her take to heart the Lord's promise that he who believes will do the works that Jesus himself does; indeed, he will do greater things still, because Jesus goes to the Father (John 14.12). Let her find in Christ the courage of her professed convictions, and begin at last the arduous and crucifying, but supremely glorious task, of transforming the world.

We believe that the essential first step in setting about this task is the complete renunciation of war by Christians.

---

[1] 'The apostles bore witness with great power to the resurrection of the Lord Jesus.'

Published by the

ANGLICAN PACIFIST FELLOWSHIP

29 GREAT JAMES STREET LONDON W.C.1

Printed at the Church Army Press, Cowley, Oxford, England. 5015